

AUG 13 1966

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700010009-8

ion, is understood as a legitimate, indeed an imperative purpose of the state in the promotion of "good government" and "national prosperity." This was a recognized principle at the time of the emergence of the new nation.

The very first Congress, which ratified the First Amendment, also assigned certain funds to subsidize Christian missionaries among the Indians; and, in one case at least, if my memory serves, the missionary thus subsidized was a Roman Catholic. This action, which must shock and outrage every conscientious "separationist," was hardly taken out of a deep concern for the Christian religion, and emphatically not out of a predilection for the Roman Catholic Church. It was taken because it was obvious to all thinking people that religion (in this case, of course, Christianity) was "necessary to good government"; and the promotion of religion among the Indians—even, where expediency dictated, the Roman Catholic version of religion—was important for the national welfare. It was with this "secular" motive that the Congress moved, thus acting upon a well-established principle.

This principle has not changed either in theory or in practice, despite the protests of a few doctrinaires. Why do we exempt religious, along with educational and charitable institutions, from the burden of taxation which might otherwise crush them? Because we recognize that religious institutions along with the others, perform an indispensable public ("secular") service. Why do we support an extensive chaplaincy system in the armed forces? Because we recognize that the chaplain in the armed forces performs an indispensable public ("secular") service essential to the national welfare. If, as Justice Douglas said some years ago in the majority opinion in the *Zorach* case, "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being," it would seem to be stultifying to prohibit the government from in any way promoting the activities of religion serving to strengthen our social institutions by strengthening their "presupposition"? And, in fact, the government has not been so inhibited, as we all know.

Theologians may very well have their qualms about a religion that is

thus converted into an instrument for strengthening the secular order of society. This aspect of the problem I hope to discuss in a later article. Here, however, my point is something quite different. My point is that, within the meaning of our political tradition and political practice, the promotion has been, and continues to be, a part of the very legitimate "secular" purpose of the state. Whatever the "neutrality" of the state in

matters of religion may be, it cannot be a neutrality between religion and no-religion, any more than (to recall the language of the Northwest Ordinance) it could be a neutrality between morality and no-morality, knowledge and no-knowledge. All three, in our American conviction, are necessary to "good government" and "national prosperity"; and all three fall within the legitimate scope of the friendly assistance of the state.

Roberto's Story

The Forgotten Young Men

WM. F. RICKENBACKER

After a lifetime of hard work with an American company in Cuba, "Roberto," until 1960, enjoyed a decent life, owned sufficient assets, and looked forward to a modestly comfortable retirement. Now almost sixty, he still moves with the energy and vigor of the champion athlete he has been, but in Miami the style of his life has changed: he'll park his old second-hand car some distance from his destination in order to save a nickel from the parking meters. He tells me about his son. . . .

At Havana University in 1960 some members of the Student Organization who had lined up against Castro found they had to flee the country. My son was among them. The students came to Miami and formed the *Directorio Revolucionario Estudiantil*.

That was about August or September 1960, six months before the Bay of Pigs, and soon afterward the CIA got in touch with the *Directorio* and assigned an agent to work with them specifically. I'll call him X. Through X the CIA selected ten or twelve of the leaders and gave them special training in counterrevolutionary activity. Sabotage, demolition, explosives, espionage, communications, all that. The idea was to send these

boys into Cuba equipped to train others, and before April 1961 the project proved to be one of the biggest sabotage operations Castro had to face.

The training here in the States was conducted very secretly. The boys would go off to one place or another for some kind of training, and my son wouldn't even tell his mother and me where he was going or where he had been. We do know he spent two weeks in Baltimore once. Eventually they were ready to infiltrate their country.

My son made two efforts to get into Cuba, but each time he came back because he hadn't gotten the right signals from shore. Finally in December 1960, X picked up my son and two or three other boys and put them on a boat for Cuba, and this time they were determined to make the landing. They missed their contact with a rowboat that was to take them ashore, but they jumped into the water to swim for it anyway—five hundred yards of shark-infested water, at midnight, and loaded down with grenades, small arms, ammunition, communication equipment.

Once inside Cuba, the boys did a real job. They stayed in touch with the CIA by radio, organized other students in anti-Castro work, and succeeded in keeping Castro's internal security forces in great disarray. They would sometimes get supplies from the CIA—caps, detonators, plastic for bombs, sidearms, rifles, am-

